

REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

Claims 1-3, 8-15, 21-25 and 30-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Greenberg (US Publication No.2003/0083577). Claims 4-7, 16-20 and 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greenberg (US Publication No.2003/0083577) in view of Dominach (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0172258). Applicant respectfully traverses the preceding rejection based on the following arguments. For at least the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-2, 4-14 and 16-34 patently define over prior art of record and reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Discussion for rejection to claims set forth in Advisory Action

The claim only states that the “fuzzy command” performs a plurality of actions, of which can be interpreted to be a command by Greenberg paragraphs [0036] and [0041]. Since the specification and claim doesn’t describe specifically what is actual meaning of the term “fuzzy.” The term “not clear” can apply broadly to many commands, such as zoom, because by saying “zoom image”, as disclosed by Greenberg (paragraphs [0036]) it is unclear exactly by how much to zoom or which image, if a plurality of images where present.

In response thereto, applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner misconstrues “zoom image”, as disclosed by Greenberg (paragraphs [0036]) to be identical to claimed “fuzzy command.” This is because the command, “zoom image”, as disclosed by Greenberg (paragraphs [0036]), is actually identical to claimed “specific command,” rather than claimed “fuzzy command.” The claimed “fuzzy command.” are such as “the image is too dark,” or “the image is too bright.” Furthermore, the claimed “fuzzy command,” when it performs, substantially consists of specific commands corresponding to optionally adjusting contrast, brightness and color, etc. Therefore, “zoom image”, as disclosed by Greenberg (paragraphs [0036]) cannot be regarded as identical to claimed “fuzzy command.”

Discussion for rejection to claims under 35 U. S. C. 102(e)

Claims 1-3, 8-15, 21-25 and 30-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Greenberg (US Publication No. 2003/0083577).

In response thereto, applicants respectfully traverses the preceding rejection based on the following arguments. First of all, to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation, the cited reference (i.e. Greenberg) should teach all claim limitations.

The amended claims 1 and 13 are partly recited as follows:

1. A method for adjusting images, suitable for adjusting a video device with a

voice-assisted system, said video device providing an on-screen display function, said method comprising:

identifying said voice command as one of a specific command and a fuzzy command based on said voice signal, wherein said fuzzy command performs a plurality of adjustment actions corresponding to said voice command, and if the adjusted image does not meet a user's expectation, the adjusted image is further modified based on the performed adjustment actions.

As set forth in **Discussion for rejection to claims set forth in Advisory Action,** the command, "zoom image", as disclosed by Greenberg (paragraphs [0036]) cannot be regarded as identical to claimed "fuzzy command." Greenberg at least fails to teach, suggest or disclose claimed "fuzzy command" as claimed in the claims 1 and 13. In other words, the claims 1 and 13 are not anticipated by Greenberg and thus patentable.

Regarding dependent claims 2, 8-12, 14, 21-25, they should be patentable for the reason that they contain all limitations of their respective patentable base claims 1 and 13.

Discussion for objection to claims under 35 U. S. C. 103(a)

Claims 4-7, 16-20 and 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greenberg (US Publication No.2003/0083577) in view of Dominach (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0172258).

In response thereto, applicant respectfully traverses the preceding rejections based on the following arguments. To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the reference themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the references or to combine references teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art references (i.e. Greenberg and Dominach) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

By applying the aforementioned arguments, since Greenberg fails to disclose claimed “fuzzy command”, even if Greenberg and Dominach could be combined, this combination still fails to disclose the “fuzzy command,” as claimed in claim 26. Thus, claim 26 is patentable because a prima facie case of obviousness is not well established. Accordingly, regarding dependent claims 27-34, they should be patentable for the reason that they contain all limitations of their patentable base claim 26.

Regarding claims 4-7, 16-20, since they are dependent claims, they should be patentable as a matter of law for the reason they contain all limitations of their respective patentable base claims 1 and 13.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all the pending claims 1-2, 4-14 and 16-34 of the present application patently define over the prior art and are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

S-Signature: / Belinda Lee/

Date : July 30, 2008

Typed Name: **Belinda Lee**

Registration No.: 46,863

Correspondence information:

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100

Roosevelt Road, Section 2

Taipei, 100

Taiwan

Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800

Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233

Email: belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw

Usa@jcipgroup.com.tw